



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## CRITICAL NOTES

### GALEN ON THE CHRISTIANS

In 1844 J. C. L. Gieseler in his *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (4th ed.), I, 1, p. 167, Anm. 16, wrote: "Der berühmte Arzt Claudius Galenus (um 160) sagte in einer seiner verloren gegangenen Schriften (die Stelle in syrischer Uebersetzung in *Bar-Hebraei Chron. syr.*, ed. *Bruns et Kirsch*, p. 55, aus *Gal. comm. in Phaedonem Platonis*, ausführlicher arabisch in *Abulfedae historia anteislamica*, ed. *Fleischer*, p. 109 aus *Gal. de sententiis politicae Platonicae* citiert): Hominum plerique . . . [the Latin of Fleischer is quoted to the words] ut nihil cedant vere philosophantibus." The same Latin is quoted, with reference to Gieseler (faulty in the English translation: I, 1, 4 [*sic!*]; the German is not accessible to the writer in the libraries of the University of Chicago), in Harnack's *History of Dogma*, I, 235, n. 2; without such reference in the same author's *Mission and Expansion*, I, 212 f.; with reference to Harnack in Norden's *Antike Kunstprosa*, p. 518, n. 1. Theodor Zahn does not quote the passage in full, but refers to Fleischer's *Abulfeda* in his *Der Stoiker Epiktet u. s. Verhältnis zum Christentum*, p. 24, Anm. 29 (cf. Anm. 27). Norden gives Harnack's reference to Gieseler correctly, and adds the information, obtained from the Arabist G. Jacob, that Abulfeda's source is Ibn al-Athîr; in the *Nachträge* of 1909, II, 4, he refers to K. Kalbfleisch, who in the *Festschrift für Gomperz* (Vienna, 1902), pp. 96 f., follows Steinschneider (Virchow's *Archiv f. pathologische Anatomie u. Physiologie*, CXXIV [1891], 459, No. 89) and Philippi (verbally) when he assumes as probable the identification of Fleischer's "de sententiis politicae Platonis" with Galen's Πλατωνικῶν διαλόγων συνόψεως ἡ. Kalbfleisch quotes at length in a translation made for him by Philippi Ibn abî Uṣaibî'a's version of Ḥunain b. Ishâq's story concerning the finding and translation of a portion of this *Synopsis*; but neither he nor Steinschneider quotes in full Ibn abî Uṣaibî'a's rendition of Galen's words on the Christians, to which both refer, as occurring in this Arabic writer's *Kitâb 'ujân al-anbâ' fî tabaqât al-'aṭibbâ'*, ed. A. Müller (Königsberg, 1884), I, 76. And there the knowledge of the moderns concerning Galen's celebrated statement concerning the Christians rests, so far as the writer's search in the literature accessible to him has been able to discover.

But a number of problems in regard to this statement remain untouched. Since Gieseler's day two Mohammedan authorities have been added for the statement, one a century, the other two-thirds of a century, earlier than Abulfeda. The version of neither has been subjected to careful scrutiny. The Christian version of Bar-Hebraeus has been quite forgotten, since Gieseler put it aside as being less explicit. It seems to have occurred to no one to inquire, How came those three Moslems, all of whom are known to be compilers, the most original of them being Ibn abi Uṣāibi'a, to fix upon just this one statement of Galen's concerning the Christians of his day? In the quest for the book of Galen's from which this statement appears to be taken, the discrepant statement of the Christian author has been left aside completely. Though there is a reference to Plato's writings, no one has, apparently, attempted to find any utterance or utterances of his which would seem to fit the occasion. No attempt has been made to determine the true intent and purport of Galen's words. A re-examination of the facts in the case is therefore quite in place. Unfortunately the Arabic and Syriac sections of the libraries within the writer's reach and the time just now at his disposal do not allow him to extend the search as far as he would like.

To begin with, Abulfeda's account has been placed before the public a sufficient number of times in Fleischer's excellent Latin translation. The Arabic has not been set forth in connection with other versions. Beginning a little before the place at which the beginning is usually made, it may be well to state that after mentioning as the only event worthy of note is Marcus Aurelius' reign Bardaisan's treatise on dualism, Abulfeda proceeds to say that Marcus died in the year 481 of the Seleucid era. Thereupon Commodus reigned in his stead, according to the Canon, for a period of thirteen years, and he brought his own life to an untimely end by hanging himself, which event took place at the close of the year 494 of the Seleucid era.

وقال في الكامل ان جالينوس كان في ايام قومودوس المذكور وقد ادرك جالينوس بطلميوس وكان دين النصرى قد ظهر في ايامه وقد ذكرهم جالينوس في كتابه في جوامع كتاب افلاطون في سياسة المدن فقال ان جمهور الناس لا يمكنهم ان يفهموا سياقة الاقاول البرهانية ولذلك صاروا محتاجين الى رموز ينتفعون بها (يعنى بالرموز الاخبار عن الثواب والعقاب في الدار الآخرة) من ذلك انا

نرى الآن القوم الذين يدعون نصارى انهم اخذوا ايمانهم عن الرموز وقد يظهر منهم افعال مثل افعال من تفلسف بالحقيقة وذاك ان عدم جزعهم من الموت امر قد نراه كلنا وكذلك ايضا عفافهم عن استعمال الجماع فان منهم قوما رجالا ونساء ايضا قد اقاموا جميع ايام حياتهم ممتنعين عن الجماع ومنهم قوم قد بلغ من ضبطهم لانفسهم في التدبير وشدة حرصهم على العدل ان صاروا غير مقصرين عن الذين يتفلسفون بالحقيقة انتهى كلام جالينوس.

According to the *Kāmil* [of Ibn Athīr] Galen lived in the days of this Commodus, having been born before the death of Ptolemy [literally: "and Galen lived to the time of Ptolemy"]. In his [i.e., Galen's] time the religion of the Christians had become manifest, and Galen mentions them [i.e., the Christians] in his book *Remarks on the Book of Plato on the Republic*, where he says: "The mass of the people are not able to follow the thread of an apodictic discourse, wherefore they need allusive (enigmatic) sayings, so that they may enjoy instruction thereby (by allusive sayings he means the tales concerning rewards and punishments in the world to come). Of this sort we now see the people who are called Christians deriving their faith from such allusive sayings. Yet on their part deeds have been produced equal to the deeds of those who are in truth philosophers. For example, that they are free from the fear of death is a fact which we all have observed; likewise their abstinence from the unlawful practice of sexual intercourse. And, indeed, there are some among them, men, and women, also, who during the whole of their natural life refrain altogether from such intercourse. And some of them have attained to such a degree of severe self-control and to such earnestness in their desire for righteousness, that they do not fall short of those who are in truth philosophers. Thus far the words of Galen.

And that is all Abulfeda has to say on the reign of Commodus.

Coming now to the acknowledged source of Abulfeda (1273-1331), we find Norden stating on the authority of G. Jacob that Abulfeda quoted the passage from the *Kāmil* of Ibn Athīr (1160-1234; the *Kāmil* stops at 1231); Norden then gives the Latin of Fleischer, with two minor changes (l. 2 *Galenus* is inserted after *fecit*; l. 5 *parabolas dicit narrationes for narrationes dicit*), which are said to be based upon a collation by G. Jacob of Fleischer's translation with the original in the

*Kāmil*. If this statement of Norden's correctly represents G. Jacob, then the writer would like to know in what edition or manuscript Professor Jacob read his Ibn Athīr. The changes might as easily have been made from the Arabic of Abulfeda himself; they merely make the Latin a little less good Latin, but a slightly more literal rendering of the Arabic of Abulfeda. In the well-known and excellent edition of Ibn Athīr by Tornberg (Leyden: Brill, 1867), Vol. I, Galen is mentioned just twice: the first time, in the confused series of Roman emperors on p. 229 a half-line is devoted to a notice of his death; the second time, on p. 233 two lines and two words are dedicated to him. This last note follows a statement concerning Marcus Aurelius' reign, which is practically identical with that of Abulfeda. Thereupon Ibn Athīr proceeds: "Then Commodus reigned twelve years. And in his days lived Galen, who was born before the death of Ptolemy [literally: who lived to the time of Ptolemy] the Claudian. In his time the Christian religion had become manifest and he mentions them in his book Remarks on the Book of Plato on the Republic." Underscoring by a continuous line marks greater, by a dotted line lesser, differences of Ibn Athīr's account from that of Abulfeda. And what is here printed is all that Ibn Athīr has to say about Galen, and all that he says at this point about Commodus; nor does he say anything vitally different on the latter anywhere else. It is manifest (1) that Abulfeda has amplified his account of Commodus and Galen from other sources, and (2) that the actual statement of Galen is missing in Ibn Athīr, which is quite what we should expect in this epitomizer. If an oriental edition or manuscript of the *Kāmil* nevertheless does contain this statement, it is highly probable that it was inserted by a scribe from Abulfeda or some other source.

The third Moslem author who is known to have quoted Galen's statement on the Christians is Ibn ʿAbī Uṣaibiʿa (1203-70), whose great book, a biographical history of noted physicians, was published by August Müller (Königsberg, 1884). His scattered notes and his lengthy statement on Galen were published in careful résumé by Steinschneider, *Virchow's Archiv*, loc. cit., and *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Beihefte, II (1890-91), 2. Thence, and with the aid of the well-known Semitic scholar Philippi, from the original Kalbfleisch, *op. cit.*, brought Uṣaibiʿa's statement to the notice of classical scholars. From Kalbfleisch in turn Norden, *op. cit.*, derived his knowledge. But Steinschneider was interested chiefly in the bibliography of Arabic translations, and Kalbfleisch in classical and Hellenistic Greek literature. Neither has given

adequate attention to the statement concerning the Christians. By the kindness of the Surgeon General's Office Library, Washington, D.C., the writer is enabled to present Uṣaibī'a's version from the rare and expensive original edition. The whole of Uṣaibī'a's treatise on Galen covers 30 pages full of fine oriental print. Much of this, in the main well summarized by Steinschneider, does not concern us here. A brief summary of what is to our purpose, leading up to the important text, suffices. Uṣ. begins with notes from or on Ishāq b. Ḥunain (†910) and Baihaqī (ca. 1161 A.D.), both of whom place Galen in the first century A.D. Thereupon follows a long argument on the incorrectness of this dating (Vol. I, 72, 11—77, 10). Steinschneider notwithstanding, the bulk of this, in fact, probably the whole of this long statement, is taken bodily from 'Ubaid Allāh b. Ḡabra'īl b. Boḥtīšū<sup>c</sup> (†ca. 1058). It does not seem to be taken from this author's larger works, but from a *risāla*, or essay, written in answer to an inquiry concerning Galen's dates (72, 11—13). That all of what follows, as far as 77, 14, with quotations from Mār Eliā, Maṭrān of Nisibis, from Hārūn b. 'Azūr ar-Rāhib, Eusebius of Caesarea, the Chronicle of Andronicus, etc., including quotations from Galen himself, is for the most part, if not in its entirety, the work, not of Uṣ., but of 'Ubaid Allāh, is shown by the opening and closing words: *هذا نصه*, "this

is a transcript of it" (72, 14), and *وهذا آخر ما ذكره عبيد الله بن*

*جبرئيل من أمر جالينوس*, "and this is the end of what 'Ubaid Allāh

b. Ḡabra'īl wrote concerning the affairs of Galen" (77, 11). In further proof of 'Ubaid Allāh's authorship may be quoted the statement "said 'Ubaid Allāh," etc., strewn, somewhat sparingly, throughout this material—and the tenor of the whole lengthy argument, all of which is meant to prove the later date for Galen, which, incidentally, is quite correct. It is worth while noting that one of the chief proof texts is Galen's statement in the preface to the first book of the *Anatomy*, that he came to Rome for the first time during the reign of Antoninus. Various events in the life of Jesus, birth, baptism, ascension, are chronologically fixed with relation to Galen. Ishāq b. Ḥunain, whose source is said to be John the Grammarian (one of the Alexandrian school of epitomizing paraphrasers of Galen), is elaborately proved to be mistaken. And then, still with chronological intent, but making a climax which has been beautifully led up to, the whole closes with Galen's laudatory statement concerning the Christians, the text of which follows:

وما يشهد بأن المسيح كان قبل جالينوس بمدة من الزمان ما ذكره جالينوس في تفسير كتاب افلاطون في السياسة المدنية وهذا نص قوله قال جالينوس من ذلك قد نرى القوم الذين يدعون نصارى انما ايمانهم عن الرموز والمعجزة وقد تظهر منهم أفعال المتفلسفين أيضا وذلك أن عدم جزعهم من الموت وما يلحقون بعده أمر قد نراه كل يوم وكذلك أيضا عفافهم عن الجماع وإن منهم قوما لا رجال فقط لكن نساء أيضا قد أقاموا أيام حياتهم ممتنعين عن الجماع ومنهم قوم قد بلغ من ضبطهم لأنفسهم في التدبير في المطعم والمشرب وشدة حرصهم على العدل أن صاروا غير مقصرين عن الذين يتفلسفون بالحقيقة

And what testifies to the fact that the Messiah lived before Galen by a considerable stretch of time is what Galen mentions in his interpretation (*tafsîr*) of the book of Plato on the *Republic*. This is a transcript of his statement. Galen says: "Of this sort we see the people who are called Christians. Only from allusive sayings and miracles is their faith. Yet on their part the deeds of the philosophizers have been produced also. For example, that they are free from the fear of death and of what they may meet thereafter, is a fact which we may observe every day; likewise their abstinence from sexual intercourse. And, indeed, there are some among them, not men only, but women also, who during their natural life refrain from such intercourse. And some of them have attained to such a degree of severe self-control in eating and drinking, and to such earnestness in their desire for righteousness, that they do not fall short of those who are in truth philosophers.

With a "said 'Ubad Allâh b. Ġabra'îl" the statement proceeds to explain that what Galen here describes is monasticism, and that in general the state of doctrine and practice depicted in these words does not correspond to the conditions obtaining in the time of the Messiah, but to those of one hundred years later. Whereupon the account of 'Ubad Allâh is closed by Uṣ.

In further proof, if this be needed, of the fact that the statement concerning the Christians with its explanation is quoted, not original with Uṣ., a fourth Moslem writer must be introduced into the discussion, al-Qiftî, an older contemporary of Uṣ. Al-Qiftî, who lived 1172-1248, wrote his great *History of the Learned* between the years 1230 and 1236. We possess this, not in the original, but in an abbreviated form

given to it by a later scholar, Zauzânî. This book, of which a magnificent edition was brought out by Julius Lippert (aided by notes and other work left by August Müller) (Leipzig, 1903), contains, like Uş., many scattered notes and a special paragraph on Galen. Not so full as Uş., he yet gives much of the same material as Uş. And—though in an entirely different context—the paragraph above quoted, with its reference to monasticism and all, is found in Qiftî practically verbatim. Except for minor differences, in which for the most part Qiftî exhibits the better text, the only difference worth noting is the loss in Qiftî, as we have him, of one sentence, the sentence on the fear of death—by homoeoteleuton.

These are the four Moslem writers, in whose works, as they have been preserved and published, Galen's laudatory words concerning the Christians are quoted, or at least mentioned. Others who knew them are mentioned in Qiftî and Uş. These are of no immediate concern to us. It is worth noting, however, that the three Moslems, largely independent of each other, quote the same text in the same translation. Important introductory words are omitted in the two earlier writers. Among the slight differences between the two, Q. and Uş. have in one case preserved what seems the better text: "From allusive sayings *only* do they derive their faith." In general their text is characterized by a slight tendency toward summarizing abbreviation, which is offset, on the other hand, by paraphrasing additions, in part interpretative. Noteworthy is the difference in the name given to Galen's work. Abulfeda and Ibn Athîr call it "Remarks on (or "Synopsis of) Plato's Book on the *Republic*"; Q. and Uş. call it "Interpretation." In this connection it is worthy of note that Uş. in his list of Galen's books and their translations into Arabic quotes on p. 101 a statement of the celebrated translator Ḥunain b. Ishâq (†873), father of the Ishâq b. Ḥunain mentioned above. In this statement Ḥunain says that he found a copy of four of the eight books of Galen's *Synopsis* (or *Remarks*, *ḡawâmiʿ*) on *Plato's Dialogues*, the dialogues commented on being (1) *Kratylos*, *Sophistes*, *Politikos*, *Parmenides*, *Euthydemus*; (2) *Republic* 1-4; (3) *Republic* 5-10 and *Timaeus*; (4) *Nomoi*. It has been shown that Q. and Uş., largely or wholly independent of each other, depend in the section in question on a Nestorian Christian of the ʿIrâq, ʿUbaid Allâh b. Gabriel of the famous family of Boḥtîšûʿ, who died *ca.* 1058. Can it be shown that the two general historians, also, who at this point exhibit such remarkable interest for the affairs of the Christians, are dependent on Christian authors? Such authors were well known and widely read in their time.



Both Q. and Uṣ. knew, besides ʿUbaid Allāh, Ibn Ġulḡul of Cordova (ca. 980) and Elias ibn al-Maṭrān (†1055).

It is of some interest to note, further, that Uṣ. does what Qiftī does not—spoils the point of ʿUbaid Allāh's fine climax by quoting immediately afterward from this Elias b. al-Maṭrān Galen's derogatory remarks about Moses and the Messiah and their followers, among them one from the *Pulses*, quoted later in this paper, and one from a lost work, *Εἰς τὸ πρῶτον κινοῦν ἀκίνητον*, all to the same effect, to furnish examples of dogmatic teaching and unreasoning faith. Uṣ. thereupon proceeds to name Pergamon (Pergamos) as the birthplace of Galen, and on the following page, from an unnamed source, quotes a legendary tale, accounting for Galen's death in Sicily by placing him on a journey to Jerusalem with the intent to see there for himself the surviving disciples of the Messiah.

Turning now to the Christian writers and coming back to Gieseler, we find him at least mentioning Bar-Hebraeus' *Chronicon Syriacum*. Of this the writer has in hand only the rather faulty edition by Bruns and Kirsch (Leipzig, 1789). But a more careful examination of this too will presently appear to be very much worth while. Here we find a man very much interested in all he can find bearing on the early Christians, interested also in early physicians, most especially Galen. He dates Galen's birth in the tenth year of Trajan, 108 A.D., at least twenty years too early (Syriac text, p. 56, ll. 14 f.; Latin, pp. 53 f.). In the reign of Hadrian he mentions *Claudius Ptolemaeus*, the astronomer, and *in the same sentence* Galen; "and Galen," he says, "studied." The Syriac form means *studied*; not as the Latin says: *Ejus* [i.e., of Ptolemy] *praeceptor fuit* Galenus medicus (p. 54). Then, under Antoninus Pius, much space is given to Galen (Syr. 57, 19—58, 20). The passage deserves fuller exposition than has yet been given to it. He says: "In his time Galen became renowned. And that he [Galen] did not live in the time of Christ our Lord, as some think, is clear from Galen's own statement; for he says in the beginning of the first book of the *Anatomy* that he had composed the first book of the *Anatomy*, when for the first time he came up to Rome in the beginning of the reign of Antoninus Pius."

ואנן זמן שבעה עשר שנה בן ארבעה עשר שנה  
 וממנה נבטל. וכל דבריו נאמרו בן ארבעה עשר שנה. וכל דבריו  
 נאמרו בן ארבעה עשר שנה. וכל דבריו נאמרו בן ארבעה עשר שנה.  
 וכל דבריו נאמרו בן ארבעה עשר שנה. וכל דבריו נאמרו בן ארבעה עשר שנה.  
 וכל דבריו נאמרו בן ארבעה עשר שנה. וכל דבריו נאמרו בן ארבעה עשר שנה.

And he says in his commentary on Plato's book *Phaedon*: We see these people, called Christians, who base their faith on allusive sayings and miracles, and they do not fall short of those who are in truth philosophers; for they love chastity and are assiduous in fasting and careful not to eat. And among them there are some, who during their whole lifetime abstain from sexual intercourse.

He thereupon goes on to say that this must refer to monasticism, which first made its appearance one hundred years after the ascension, while the death of Galen falls, upon reliable information, one hundred and sixty years after the ascension. Then he has more to say about Galen's coming from Pergamos (i.e., Pergamon), his many books on medicine, of which about one hundred are still extant, and his revivification of the science of Hippocrates:

And when he was told about the miracles and healings which Christ our Lord had accomplished, he said: I do not doubt that they were accomplished by divine power. And he inquired whether any of his disciples were still living, and being told that there were some in Jerusalem he rose to go to Jerusalem. But when he reached Sicily, he died there eighty-eight years old.

Bar-Hebraeus closes his statement regarding Galen with a brief version of the story told in Galen's *Περὶ θηριακῆς πρὸς Παμφιλιανόν*, ed. Kühn, XIV, 299 (it may be remarked, in passing, that both the Syriac and the Arabic of Bar-Hebraeus, and the Arabic of *al-Qiftî* and *Agapius Mabbugensis*, substitute "the city of Antioch" for Galen's *τὴν Ἰταλιῶτιν χῶραν* in this passage). Immediately thereafter Ptolemaeus Claudius is again mentioned. Galen is mentioned once more, in passing, as having been named "mule's head" by Alexander Aphrodisiensis on account of his obstinacy in disputation and controversy (Syr. 59, 8). A little later follows a note concerning the death of Commodus by strangulation.

The Arabic of this chronicle, *Historia Dynastiarum*, which the writer has only in Pococke's edition, Oxford, 1663, differs considerably from the Syriac. It was written some years later, and Bar-Hebraeus had learned in the meantime. As Pococke's careful index shows, Galen is mentioned in four distinct places: (1) Arabic text, p. 86, l. 3; Latin, 55, in connection with Hippocrates; (2) Arabic, 91, 10; Latin, 59, in connection with Rufus, the Physician; (3) Arabic, 104, 11; Latin, 67, in connection with Dioscorides (these three statements are not found in the Syriac, though Galen's work on Hippocrates is there mentioned); (4) Arabic, 122, 16—123, 16; Latin, 77 f. Again it is the reign of Antoninus Pius. Brief mention is made of Valentinus and Marcion; then follows Galen, his many books, the theriac story, his Pergamene

origin. Then follows an apocryphal statement about his practicing medicine in Alexandria. We return to the Syriac with the statement about the time when he lived. Then comes, slightly different from the Syriac, the note that this was more than one hundred years after the ascension. The statement on the Christians differs slightly from the Syriac: Galen's book is called a commentary (شرح), Plato's book is "the book of Plato on ethics" (الاخلاق) named Phâdon (فادن) and the passage is quoted as follows:

ان هاولا القوم الذين يسمون نصاري تراهم قد بنوا مذهبهم  
على الرموز والمعجزات وليسوا باقل من الفلاسفة الحقيقيين باعمالهم  
يجبون العفة ويدمنون الصوم والصلوة ويجتنبون المظالم وفيهم اناس  
لا يدنسون بالنسا

Behold, these people, who are named Christians; you [the Arabic may have read *we*] see how they have built their belief on allusive sayings and miracles, and they are not beneath the true philosophers in their deeds, loving continence (*or* chastity) and abiding in fasting and prayer, and shunning wickedness; and among them are some, who are not defiled with women.<sup>1</sup>

He goes on: "I say that he means by the allusive sayings the parables indited on the Kingdom of Heaven in the holy evangel." His death is then related as in the Syriac, but with omission of the legendary features. Ptolemy the Claudian is thereupon mentioned, and a little later, as in the Syriac, the statement of Alexander Aphrod. concerning Galen. Marcus Aurelius and Commodus follow, a bit more historically than in the Syriac. Commodus "died by strangulation." In his reign are named and briefly described Tatian, Montanus, and Bardaisan.

It is impossible for the writer at present to examine more closely the relation of Bar-Hebraeus to his predecessors, who wrote in Syriac. He belongs to the generation succeeding Ibn Athîr, his dates being 1226-89; apparently in some measure dependent on Ibn Athîr, as his confused mass of Antonines seems to indicate, he is yet largely independent of this source, especially in his statements on Galen. It is said that he used Qiftî, and it will presently appear that he knew and used Uṣaibî'a. But the statement on the Christians is not taken from them.

There were Arabic Christian writers who preceded Uṣaibî'a and Ibn Athîr. The first of these, in all probability, was Eutychius of

<sup>1</sup> The text of Ṣaḥḥānî, which has just come to the writer's hand, as he is reading proof, does not at this point differ materially from Pococke. Ṣaḥḥānî's index adds two further passages on Galen, neither of which, however, has to do with the matter in hand.

Alexandria (Saʿīd ibn al-Baṭrīq), 867–940. Eutychius' *Annals* were published in 1906 by Cheikho in the *CSCO*, Ser. III, Tom. VI, 1. It is interesting to note that he mentions Galen, indeed, in the reign of Commodus (p. 105), and quotes with approval some of his words, *but not the statement regarding the Christians*. Neither does the Egyptian contemporary of Bar-Hebraeus, Petros (Buṭrus ibn Rāhib), who seems merely to have extracted Eutychius, have this statement.

But of late there has come to light another Christian historian of Syria, contemporary with, and but slightly, if any, younger than, Eutychius. The pragmatic compendium of universal history, *Kitāb al-ʿUnwān*, of Agapius of Mabbug-Hierapolis, was first published by a pupil of the late Russian master, Rosen, Alexander A. Vasiliev, in the *Patrologia Orientalis*; but Vasiliev's work is still incomplete. Meanwhile the indefatigable Cheikho has brought out a complete edition of the Arabic text in the *CSCO*, Ser. III, Tom. V. Agapius, son of Constantine (Maḥbūb al Manbiḡī), bishop of Hierapolis in Northern Syria in the first half of the tenth century, alludes to the year 942 as the year in which he was writing at least the latter part of his history. This places him slightly later than Eutychius of Alexandria, who died in 940. He was a Melchite in religion, a Greek in origin, and he knew and read both Greek and Syriac in addition to Arabic. The Florentine manuscript, the only manuscript known, which contains the latter part of Agapius' history, from Theodosius II, has up to this point a history of the Roman Caesars. In the Florentine text the length of Commodus' reign, and a list of the bishops of Rome, Antioch, Byzantium, and Jerusalem during his time, constitute the sum and substance of what is mentioned at this point. The reign of Marcus Aurelius, however, is much more fully dealt with. The tale closes with a long story about Bardaiṣan, similar to that found in the chronicle of Michael the Syrian († 1199). The Florentine text, however, is in part a mere sketchy extract from the fuller text, which forms the close of the first part of the history.

The first part, however, as published by Cheikho from one manuscript at Oxford and five others in the Orient, is, for the reign of Commodus, much fuller. The Bardaiṣan story, also, is no longer told under Marcus Aurelius, but under Commodus. The exact relation of the two texts to each other is not wholly clear to the writer at present; he himself has no time to examine it more closely, nor has he access to the work of Vasiliev on the subject. He must content himself, therefore, with this brief statement. Most interesting, however, is the paragraph preceding that on Bardaiṣan. Immediately following the note on the

accession of Commodus and the length of his reign, we find the following (pp. 180, 8—181, 5): Justinus Martyr is given brief mention, as is Dioscorides, whom the note following his name places distinctly in the reign of Hadrian. Then comes Galen, “the master in the art of medicine” (Buṭrus ibn Rāhib and Euty chius of Alexandria). He became renowned at this time and was very skilful in the art of medicine. His many books are mentioned, of which about one hundred are still extant; in this sentence the version of Bar-Hebraeus exhibits only very slight differences. Then comes the theriac story, almost exactly as in Bar-Hebraeus; likewise his Pergamene origin and Alexandrian practice and the dating from the ascension with mention of those who place him earlier. Galen’s book is called a commentary (شرح) as in Bar-Hebraeus and under the misspelt **فادون** the Phaidon (**فادون**) is still clearly apparent; the “ethics” of Bar-Hebraeus, however, is omitted. In the text of the quotation Bar-Hebraeus’ **تراهم**, “you see (them),” is omitted; **لأنهم**, “because they,” is inserted after “deeds”; **يرعون**, “they observe,” is read for **يدمنون**, “they abide in”; **يتدنسون** appears in place of **يدنسون**, a mere slight difference in a grammatical form, both meaning the same, “who are (not) defiled.” The note concerning the parables is precisely the same; likewise the note on the death and age of Galen, except for a grammatical error committed by Cheikho. The succeeding note concerning Galen’s relations with Commodus and his researches as Agapius relates it is not found in precisely this form in any of the Arabic statements concerning Galen which have come to the writer’s notice. But this need not detain us.

It is clear at a glance that we have here before us the immediate source of Bar-Hebraeus’ Arabic. For the full text of the Moslems, as we have seen, Agapius cannot be the immediate source; perhaps none of the Moslem writers used him directly at this point. But the fact that the two general historians quoted mention Galen and his statement at this point, in the reign of Commodus, is remarkable. It is plainly necessary to consider separately the very fact that the Moslem historians here mention Galen’s remark on the Christians and the diversity of the texts quoted. The fact that the Moslem historians at this point exhibit interest almost solely for the affairs of the Christians can be accounted for only on the supposition that they are treading in the footsteps of Christian writers. Abulfeda’s note on the suicide of Commodus looks like an improved Bar-Hebraeus; his reference to the “Canon” points to the

source of the improvement (cf. e.g., Eusebius' *Chronikon-Kanon*, ed. Karst, p. 223). The striking remark in Ibn Athîr, followed by Abulfeda, that Galen "lived to the time of Ptolemaeus Claudius," which can only by main force be made to mean "he was born before the death of Ptolemy," points to a similar, if not an identical, source for both Ibn Athîr and Bar-Hebraeus, who, with more extended notice of Ptolemy, exhibits the same uncertainty as to Ptolemy's dates and the same tendency to bring him into relation with Galen; what this common source of these two writers was will presently appear. The prominent mention given to Galen at this point evidently antedates Agapius of Hierapolis; for it is found also in his older contemporary Eutychius, though the two are manifestly largely independent of each other at this point, with a bare possibility remaining that Agapius had seen the work of Eutychius. Again, the writer is unable to proceed farther along this line of inquiry. But one fact stands out clearly: the man who introduced Galen's statement on the Christians into this paragraph of the universal histories written in Arabic was Agapius of Hierapolis.

How then is the diversity in the texts of the statement to be explained? For manifestly this diversity is greater than Gieseler's words indicate; Abulfeda's text is not merely fuller than that of Agapius and Bar-Hebraeus, it is an utterly different text. The Greek is fairly apparent under the Arabic of both, more conspicuous in Abulfeda's version; but the Greek under the Arabic and Syriac of the Christians is *not the Greek of Galen*. Galen never said that the Christians of his day "observed" or "were constant in fasting and prayer," nor that they "were not defiled with women." But the Greek underlying Abulfeda's version is *Galen's Greek*. In the *inability of the masses to follow an apodictic discourse*, in the *those who are in truth philosophers*, etc., Galen's idiom fairly urges itself upon the reader. It would be an easy matter to retranslate Abulfeda's Arabic into Greek composed of Galen's own words and phrases; but as this would be a mere schoolboy's exercise of a kind which usually does more harm than good, such a retranslation is better left undone. Moreover, the sentiment and thought of Abulfeda's text is Galen's. The eclectic philosopher's recognition of what is good in the Christians is obvious. This scientific objectivity means much in this case, for Galen was not a Christian, nor wholly in sympathy with their point of view. This is clear from the other passages where he mentions them (cf. Galen's works, ed. Kühn, I, XLII, n. w, and see above under Uṣaibī'a). Those now extant are in the Περὶ διαφορᾶς σφνγμῶν. In refuting a dogmatic statement of Archigenes on eight qualities of the pulses, Galen

says (ed. Kühn, VIII, 579, ll. 13-17): κάλλιον δ' ἂν ἦν πολλῷ προσθεῖναι τινα, εἰ καὶ μὴ βεβαίαν ἀπόδειξιν, παραμυθίαν γ' οἷν ἱκανὴν τῷ λόγῳ περὶ τῶν ὀκτῶ ποιημάτων, ἵνα μὴ τις εὐθὺς κατ' ἀρχὰς, ὥς εἰς Μωϋσοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ διατριβὴν ἀφιγμένος, νόμων ἀναποδείκτων ἀκούῃ, καὶ ταῦτα ἐν οἷς ἤκιστα χρή. Yet Archigenes and his school are not to be persuaded nor convinced by any reasoning or proofs. So he goes on to say later in the same work (*op. cit.*, ll. 656-57) that he finally became proudly silent, thinking with the Κωμικός: 'Ὡς οὔτε στρεβλὸν ὀρθοῦται ξύλον, οὔτε γερανδριὸν μετατεθεὶν μωσχεύεται. θᾶπτον γὰρ ἂν τις τοὺς ἀπὸ Μωϋσοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ μεταδιδάξειεν ἢ τοὺς ταῖς αἱρέσεσι προστετηκότας ἰατροὺς τε καὶ φιλοσόφους. This latter statement reminds one of Pliny's opinion of the Christians. It goes to show that, on the other hand, one must not consider Galen's praise of certain qualities and attainments of the Christians a commendation of Christians and Christianity *in toto*, such as the version of Agapius would make it. In fact, the whole point of the passage probably lies rather in the persiflage it contains on the claims of the Platonic school and of Platonic philosophy than in the praise of the Christians. At this point it becomes clear in Abulfeda's version that what we have here is Galen's *thought*, as well as his Greek, *not* Plato's thought. Here Galen exhibits the evil side of his eclectic philosophy, as above we saw him exhibit the good. Here it becomes manifest that Galen had not, what was Plato's birthright, aristocratic reserve, and that, on the other hand, he is moved by what is absent in Plato's mind, scientific vanity (hence Alexander Aphrodisiensis' epithet for Galen, "mule's head"). Of the genuineness of the words in Abulfeda's version there can, therefore, hardly be a question.

What precise words of Plato's are referred to is, however, not so easy to determine, as will be apparent from the foregoing. The writer has made such diligent search as was possible for him in the *Phaedo*, the *Politicus*, and the *Republic*. In the *Phaedo*, for example, 69ed offers a point of contact, as does 92d. In the *Politicus* 304cd might have given occasion for the remark. And in the *Republic* perhaps 382cd or 494a might be considered. Of the passages mentioned the *Phaedo* sentences look most likely. And perhaps someone who knows his Plato better than the writer may be able to furnish still better clues for Galen's words. In spite of this the writer feels constrained in this matter to decide with the Moslems for the *Republic*. In the first place, the nature of Galen's work on the *Dialogues* of Plato must be considered. Steinschneider and Kalbfleisch make much of the name *Synopsis* as against commentary. So far as the Arabic *ḡawāmi'* goes and the successful identification of the work of Galen's from which the passage is quoted, Steinschneider is

correct enough. Then how account for the unmistakable Arabic of 'Ubad Allāh and Agapius, and the Syriac of Bar-Hebraeus, all of which, though two different Arabic words are used, can only mean *interpretation* or commentary? This question is answered by Galen himself in the Προοίμιον of his Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων (ed. Kühn, XIX, 111): ὑποτυπώσεις γοῦν ἔγραψαν ἔνιοι τῶν πρὸ ἐμοῦ τὰ τοιαῦτα βιβλία καθάπερ τινὲς ὑπογραφαί, ἕτεροι δ' εἰσαγωγὰς ἢ συνόψεις ἢ ὑφηγήσεις· ἐγὼ δ' ἀπλῶς δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς οὐδὲν ἐπέγραψα· καὶ διὰ τοῦθ' ὕστερον εἰς πολλοὺς ἀφικομένων ἄλλος ἄλλην ἐπιγραφὴν ἐποιήσατο. This passage shows pretty clearly what Galen means by *Synopsis*—not at all what it means to us, nor, strictly speaking, a commentary, but rather, as the writer has translated the Arabic of the Moslem historians, *remarks* or *comments*. This, as well as the true meaning of Galen's words above indicated, makes it clear that what must be looked for is rather the general tenor of the work of Plato in question than specific passages in them. From this point of view the *Phaedo* offered a most sympathetic book to the Christians and to their understanding and version of Galen's words (note the addition in Bar-Hebraeus' Arabic "on ethics"). On the other hand, the *Republic*, with its apparently extravagant claims for the value of true philosophy, was precisely the book to elicit a remark of this nature from Galen. The probable source of the two versions also points to the greater accuracy of the Moslems. Whence did Agapius derive his text and information? In spite of the fact that he belongs to the very next generation after the great translators Qostā ibn Lûqā, Ḥunain, and Ḥubaish, it is practically certain that his text is not that of Ḥunain. The translation may be his own, but whether he received it in Greek or in Arabic, there are several indications which point pretty clearly to the place whence he derived it. The theriac story, the practice of Galen in Alexandria, which latter is absolutely unhistorical, and the sketchy summary nature of his text, as well as the epithet "master of the art of medicine," all point in the same direction, namely, to the paraphrasing epitomizers of the Alexandrian school (Steinschneider, *Virchow's Archiv*, loc. cit., pp. 277 f.). On the other hand, of the Moslems it is practically certain that Uṣaibīfa personally knew and had Ḥunain's text. His own and his predecessor Qiftī's text of the statement regarding the Christians is not, indeed, derived directly from Ḥunain. As has been shown, both quote Ibn Boḥtīsā. But comparison with Abulfeda shows that the two are in essence identical. And the title *ḡawḍmi* of Ibn Athīr and Abulfeda, together with the note found in Uṣaibīfa, makes it practically certain that this is the text of Ḥunain, quoted directly by 'Ubad Allāh and by Abulfeda (or an unknown source of his), and that the place whence it is



derived is the *Synopsis on the Republic*. The queer note about Ptolemaeus Claudius in Athîr and Abulfeda, which plainly contradicts the dating of Galen in the reign of Commodus, also points to the faulty chronology which was apparently the common property of Ḥunain, his son Ishâq and their source, John the Grammarian, of Alexandria.

The parenthetic remark on the meaning of "allusive sayings" is inserted in the Christian version by Agapius or his source. In the Moslem version given by Abulfeda it may be traced to Ḥunain. The explanation of Bar-Hebraeus, Qiftî, and Uṣ. about the reference of the statement to monasticism is clearly from the pen of 'Ubaid Allâh. Bar-Hebraeus' position for the note on Galen is his own, resulting from his faulty chronology, which is due to his confusion about the Antonines, his hasty reading of Boḥtîsî's careful statement, and, perhaps, some indirect influence of the chronological errors of Ḥunain and the Alexandrian epitomizers, which latter may account for the queer Ptolemy-clause of Athîr and Abulfeda, as well. The slight differences in Bar-Hebraeus' Arabic of the statement concerning the Christians from that of Agapius are probably due to conflation with Ḥunain's text, as found in Uṣ. Whence come the earlier notes on Galen in Bar-Hebraeus' Arabic the writer cannot stop to inquire; it is said that they are from Qiftî (Lippert, *Einleitung*, p. 17). As for Bar-Hebraeus' Syriac, that is a different matter. In all except the last three lines this follows closely in the sequence of events the Galen story of Uṣaibî'a. From Uṣ. also Bar-Hebraeus derived the legendary journey toward Jerusalem. The text of the statement regarding the Christians and its ascription to the *Commentary on the Phaedo* exhibits conflation with Agapius of Mabbug-Hierapolis. From him, too, is derived the theriac tale, which occupies the last three lines. Most of this material, including the theriac story, which is missing in Uṣ. is found in Qiftî also, but so differently arranged that we may be sure the busy bishop did not use him for his source. The Syriac of Bar-Hebraeus therefore seems to be a much abbreviated Uṣ., conflate with Agapius and possibly another source (the revivification of Hippocrates).

That this inquiry leaves many gaps between Galen and us, on the one hand, and between Plato and Galen on the other, unfilled, is perfectly clear to the writer. He will welcome any and all criticism or assistance; in fact, he thinks he has opened the discussion of a problem, not finally solved it. In the interest of science he asks that, if possible, such additions be made in this *Journal*. Scattering notes, little or big, on the same subject in obscure corners of widely separated journals is, in the writer's belief, a public misdemeanor in the world-empire of science.

M. SPRENGLING